



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,435	01/10/2002	Takashi Kariya	217883U/S3PCT	6548
22850	7590	07/30/2004		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER GOFF II, JOHN L				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1733				

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 10/030,435	Applicant(s) KARIYA, TAKASHI	
	Examiner John L. Goff	Art Unit 1733	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-5.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.


8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 1733

Continuation of 2.

Claim 1 as amended would require "stacking an outermost conductor layer made of copper foil". Previously the claims did not require the outermost conductor layer to comprise copper foil such that the amendment presents new issues that would require further search and/or consideration. Additionally if the amendments to the specification were re-submitted in a separate paper not presenting any new issues the amendments would be entered.

Regarding the multilayer taught by Gerber et al., it is noted Gerber et al. teach "such an interconnect could be used to attach a single or multiplicity of layers", i.e. the printed boards of the multilayer shown for example in Figure 9, "to a rigid substrate" (Figures 9 and 11 and Column 5, lines 61-68 and Column 6, lines 1-3 and Column 7, lines 18-56). The rigid substrate may be a flex circuit (i.e. a conductor layer) or a tin plated copper substrate (i.e. a conductor layer), both attached by a bonding layer, such that the limitation "stacking an outermost conductor layer on an insulating layer side of a first outermost printed board with a bonding layer being interposed therebetween" is met. Furthermore, it is noted a second rejection was made over Gerber et al. in view of Bohn or Johnston in the event it was shown Gerber et al. do not teach an outermost conductor layer. Applicant has not established that Gerber et al. do not teach an outermost conductor layer in light of the language above (i.e. Figures 9 and 11 and Column 5, lines 61-68 and Column 6, lines 1-3 and Column 7, lines 18-56 of Gerber et al.). As to applicants arguments regarding Bohn or Johnston, it is noted Bohn or Johnston are cited only to show it is well known and conventional in the art to cover layers such as the (upper) outermost layer of the multilayer (Figure 9) in Gerber et al. with a conductor layer otherwise the multilayer taught by Gerber et al. would not operate.



JEFF A. FERGUSON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300